

REMARKS

Before entry of this Amendment and Response, the status of the application according to the pending Office action is as follows:

- Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention;
- Claims 1-6, 12, and 55-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,529,183 to MacLean et al. (hereinafter “MacLean”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,344,848 to Rowe et al. (hereinafter “Rowe”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,384,688 to Rockwell (hereinafter “Rockwell”);
- Claims 7-11, 17, and 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacLean in view of Rowe and Rockwell, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0002098 to Haanpaa et al. (hereinafter “Haanpaa”);
- Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacLean in view of Rowe and Rockwell, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0140673 to Tanaka (hereinafter “Tanaka”);
- Claims 13-16, 18-19, and 63-64 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims;
- Claim 54 is allowed; and
- Claims 27-53 are cancelled.

With this Amendment and Response, Applicants hereby amend claims 1 and 14, cancel claims 13, 16, and 62 without prejudice, and add new claim 65. Claims 27-53 were previously

cancelled. Claim 14 is amended to change its dependency. Amended claim 1 is objected-to claim 13 rewritten in independent form, including the subject matter of the base claim. New claim 65 is objected-to claim 16 rewritten in independent form, including the subject matter of claim 1. Support for the amended and new claims may be found in the application as filed, at least at claims 13 and 16. No new matter is added thereby.

1. Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. With this Amendment and Response, Applicants have cancelled claim 62 without prejudice, thus rendering the rejection moot.

2. Claims 1-6, 12, and 55-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacLean in view of Rowe and Rockwell. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections as applied to the claims, as amended.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 16. According to the Office action, claim 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1, and all claims depending therefrom, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over MacLean in view of Rowe and Rockwell. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6, 12, and 55-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over MacLean in view of Rowe and Rockwell.

3. Claims 7-11, 17, and 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacLean in view of Rowe and Rockwell, and further in view of Haanpaa. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as applied to the claim, as amended.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 16. According to the Office action, claim 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1, and all claims depending therefrom, namely claims 7-11, 17, and 20-26, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over MacLean in view of Rowe and Rockwell, and further in view of Haanpaa. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7-11, 17, and 20-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over MacLean in view of Rowe and Rockwell, and further in view of Haanpaa.

4. Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacLean in view of Rowe and Rockwell, and further in view of Tanaka. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as applied to the claim, as amended.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 16. According to the Office action, claim 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1, and all claims depending therefrom, namely claim 61, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over MacLean in view of Rowe and Rockwell, and further in view of Tanaka. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 61 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over MacLean in view of Rowe and Rockwell, and further in view of Tanaka.

5. Claims 13-16, 18-19, and 63-64 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's recognition of the allowability of these claims, amend claim 1 to incorporate the subject matter of dependent

claim 16, and also present new claim 65, which incorporates the subject matter of claims 1 and 13.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection and objection, and allowance of claims 1-12, 14-15, 17-26, 54-61, and 63-65 in due course. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative by telephone at the number listed below to discuss any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 18, 2008
Registration No. 51,842

Tel. No.: (617) 570-1905
Fax No.: (617) 523-1231
Customer No. 051414

Electronic Signature: / Andrew L. Jagenow/
Andrew L. Jagenow
Attorney for the Applicants
Goodwin Procter LLP
Exchange Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02109